

EXHIBIT G

Ralph Zipper, M.D., FACOG, FPMRS

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
3 CHARLESTON DIVISION

4 Master File No. 2:12-MD-02327
5 MDL No. 2327

6 JOSEPH R. GOODWIN U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

7 IN RE: ETHICON, INC.
8 PELVIC REPAIR SYSTEM PRODUCTS LIABILITY
9 LITIGATION
10 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
11 Sharon Carpenter, et al. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
12 et al.

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00554

13 Joy Essman, et al. v. Ethicon, Inc., et
14 al.,

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00277

15 Barbara A. Hill, et al. v. Ethicon, Inc.,
16 et al.,

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00806

17 Brenda Riddell, et al. v. Ethicon, Inc., et
18 al.,

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00547

19 Barbara J. Vignos-Ware, et al. v. Ethicon,
20 Inc., et al.,

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-00761

21 - - - - - /

22 RALPH ZIPPER, M.D., FACOG, FPMRS
23 March 20, 2016

24 - - -

GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
877.370.3377 ph|917.591.5672 fax
deps@golkow.com

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 238</p> <p>1 So at the end of the day, 2 the overall failure rate, when you 3 consider untreated compartment, is 4 dramatically higher with Prolift compared 5 to native tissue. Withagen demonstrates 6 that. When Withagen looks in his next 7 paper and reports on it, all 8 compartments, not just the treated 9 compartment failure, even use the hymenal 10 ring, Prolift performs four times worse 11 than native tissue.</p> <p>12 And this is something that's 13 been shown over and over again by other 14 authors.</p> <p>15 Q. Dr. Zipper, is your 16 interpretation of that comparison that we 17 just read, is your interpretation that, 18 when you consider all compartment failure 19 between the groups, that mesh fared 20 worse?</p> <p>21 A. Remember I said I wouldn't 22 look at this one Withagen paper in 23 isolation, because those authors continue 24 to report on that -- on that data set,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 240</p> <p>1 Q. Doctor, you have some 2 opinions in your reports regarding the 3 information warnings for Prolift and 4 Prosima. And you say that those are 5 inadequate, correct?</p> <p>6 MR. THORNBURGH: Objection. 7 THE WITNESS: Yes. 8 BY MR. TOMASELLI:</p> <p>9 Q. All right. And when do you 10 believe you became an expert in warnings, 11 sir?</p> <p>12 A. I am -- I represent myself 13 as an industry expert in labels and 14 safety and -- and safety and efficacy 15 analysis and validation. And in the last 16 two years alone, I've been hired at the 17 executive level to create labels, 18 labeling guidelines, safety and efficacy 19 plans for medical devices from companies 20 that had been publicly traded in the past 21 that have multi-million dollar 22 valuations.</p> <p>23 My expertise in industry 24 standards, including labeling, safety and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 239</p> <p>1 and when they went back and report on 2 that data set including the untreated 3 compartment failure, they realized that 4 the mesh performed very poorly in 5 comparison. The Prolift performed very 6 poorly in comparison to the native tissue 7 surgery, secondary to the incredibly high 8 incidence of untreated compartment 9 failure, as over 50 percent in the 10 anterior compartment, meaning when you 11 treat the anterior compartment with 12 Prolift and not the posterior 13 compartment, Withagen found a 50 percent 14 incidence -- 53 percent incidence of 15 untreated compartment failure.</p> <p>16 And when Withagen went back 17 and looked at that, the Withagen group 18 said, "Wow, when we look at all the 19 compartments, this is a bust. The 20 Prolift ends up with a much higher 21 failure rate compared to the native 22 tissue surgery, even when we look at the 23 hymenal ring as the endpoint and not 24 Stage 0 and Stage 1 prolapse."</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 241</p> <p>1 efficacy, is by way of 20ish years of 2 working as an educator in the industry, 3 educating over a thousand surgeons, 4 educating hundreds of sales 5 representatives, educating executives 6 from device companies, working as a 7 consultant for device companies, editing 8 labels, creating -- providing labeling 9 advice, helping bringing devices to 10 market for those companies, working as an 11 executive for my own device companies, 12 creating labeling plans, creating labels, 13 creating safety and efficacy plans.</p> <p>14 In the last year alone, I've 15 done that, as I've stated, for two 16 companies. And as little as two weeks 17 ago, I was hired as an executive to 18 create a labeling plan and a safety and 19 efficacy plan for another multi, 20 multi-million-dollar valuation company 21 coming to the market.</p> <p>22 So based on this 23 accumulation of experience, I've become 24 intimately familiar with industry</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 242</p> <p>1 standards in safety, efficacy, and 2 labeling. 3 And I take those standards 4 when I'm going to look at a device like 5 Prolift or Prosima, and I look at all of 6 the medical and scientific literature 7 pertaining to that device. I look at all 8 the internal documents pertaining to that 9 device. I combine that with my 10 knowledge, training, and experience, and 11 I put that against the standards which I 12 am so intimately familiar with, which has 13 become a significant portion of my life. 14 And by way of example, if we 15 look at labeling, even though the 16 standards are very well defined, they're 17 also quite simple. If you're going to 18 label, you be -- you provide complete 19 disclosure. If it's an instruction for 20 use, the user has to be able to safely 21 and effectively use the device. 22 You need to provide all the 23 material facts. You need to provide to 24 the end user the uncertainties, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 244</p> <p>1 system categories. 2 For the quality systems, for 3 example, by way of example, when we look 4 at Ethicon, they established standardized 5 quality systems. They had a good DDSA 6 policy. They had a good failure modes -- 7 effects analyses policy. 8 But they didn't -- they 9 weren't true to them. They didn't 10 enforce them. They breached the wrong 11 policies. Therefore, there's a deviation 12 from the standard. 13 Safety and efficacy, very 14 simple. Your device needs to be safe and 15 efficacious compared to alternatives. 16 You need to be able to demonstrate 17 that -- lab data, animal data, human 18 data -- and then you compare that to 19 existing alternatives, and there's a 20 risk/benefit analysis. 21 So these are the methods 22 that I applied: my years of experience 23 in the industry; my years of experience 24 working as a consultant on labeling, on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 243</p> <p>1 knowns, the unknowns, differences in 2 opinion, avoid ambiguity. 3 And so if I'm going to look 4 at a device, for instance, like Prolift 5 and Prosima, by way of an example, I 6 might say, well, if Ethicon knew or 7 suspected that its device could cause 8 pelvic floor tension myalgia or 9 myofascial pain syndrome, or if Ethicon 10 knew or even suspected that the 11 implantation of its devices could take 12 patients who had pelvic pain and create a 13 difficult and unique scenario where 14 pelvic pain was worsened and uniquely 15 difficult to treat, well, if I was to 16 find they knew that, then I would find 17 that they didn't disclose the material 18 facts and, therefore, their label would 19 be outside the standards which I've come 20 to know. 21 When we look at safety and 22 efficacy, really, I -- there are two 23 basic categories: the clinical 24 evaluation categories and the quality</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 245</p> <p>1 safety and efficacy; providing guidance 2 to other people's device companies, to my 3 own device companies; educating people 4 from device companies. 5 I take those standards, 6 worldwide standards that I've become 7 familiar with, which I've been hired to 8 work with and help device companies for, 9 and I apply them to the companies based 10 on their internal documents, based on the 11 scientific literature, based on my 12 knowledge, training, and experience, and 13 either they pass the litmus test or they 14 don't. 15 Q. And so if I understand your 16 answer there, you would consider that 17 this expertise on warnings goes back many 18 years? 19 A. It's developed as a process 20 over the course of the last 20 years. 21 Q. All right. 22 A. And I've become stronger and 23 stronger to where, over the last couple 24 years, I have become recognized and</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 sought after by fantastic young device 2 companies with very exciting technology 3 at various stages of development. 4 Q. Right. When you say the 5 last couple years, 2013, 2014? 6 A. I've been doing this for way 7 longer than that. 8 Q. Okay. Fair enough. 9 And when do you believe -- 10 maybe it's the same answer, but when do 11 you believe you became an expert on what 12 information needs to go into the IFU? 13 Would the same answer apply? 14 A. It's an evolving process, 15 but certainly I've been doing it for 16 others for eight to ten years. 17 Q. Okay. 18 A. Doing it for myself for a 19 little bit less than that, and over the 20 last two years have worked more 21 extensively as a consultant providing 22 this type of guidance and have taken on a 23 role as president and COO of a formerly 24 publicly traded company with a multi --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 you became an expert in those FDA 2 regulations -- 3 MR. THORNBURGH: Objection. 4 BY MR. TOMASELLI: 5 Q. -- that you mention in your 6 reports? 7 MR. THORNBURGH: Objection. 8 THE WITNESS: I -- 9 BY MR. TOMASELLI: 10 Q. Would it be the same answer, 11 that it's many years? 12 A. My -- I represent myself as 13 an expert in industry standards, and I 14 gave you a narrative a moment ago 15 describing how I developed as an expert 16 or how I came to be intimately familiar 17 and have expertise in the standards that 18 pertain to labeling and safety and 19 efficacy. 20 Now, those standards have 21 been codified by the ISO, by the FDA, 22 utilized by the Committee Européene, 23 which is the CE that you think of. 24 But these are just different</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 probably at this point a \$25 million 2 valuation to supervise their labeling, 3 their safety and efficacy pathways, and 4 regulatory -- I'm sorry. Not 5 regulatory -- safety and efficacy 6 pathways and research and development, is 7 what I meant to say. 8 And just two weeks ago, 9 another device company that exists 10 outside the medical space has hired me 11 for the same purposes, to help them with 12 their labeling, to help them with their 13 safety and efficacy, and bring them to 14 market. 15 Q. You discuss some of the 16 medical regulations for devices in your 17 reports, and I think you just referenced 18 them. 19 A. No, I actually I meant to 20 say research and development. I 21 corrected that. 22 Q. All right. In terms of the 23 regulations pertaining to mesh and 24 medical devices, when do you believe that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 codifications of the standards which have 2 existed forever. And if you have -- if 3 you're familiar with the basic guidelines 4 required to be a good, ethical human 5 being and perform your fiduciary duties 6 to a company, you coincidentally will 7 typically be in alignment with guidance 8 from those various agencies, including 9 the ISO and the FDA, and, in doing those, 10 often be ready to have notified in body 11 state that you meet the CE guidelines or 12 needs, and does. 13 So to answer -- and in 14 final, I've been familiar with the FDA 15 guidelines for many years, but more 16 crystalized to the specific codes and the 17 minutia of it over the last few years. 18 Q. All right. And probably, I 19 guess just to put a time point on that, 20 going to the early 2010s or so? 21 A. I don't know. 22 MR. THORNBURGH: Objection. 23 BY MR. TOMASELLI: 24 Q. All right. When do you</p>